16 September 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, Employee Activity Branch

SUBJECT : Study for Proposed Formation of
"Organization of Former Employees
of CIA"

    1. This is forwarded in response for your request for
immediate comment regarding the attached paper concerning
the study for the proposed formation of "Organization of
Former Employees of CIA". It is noted that the attached
paper presents security questions in the following portions
of the attachment:

    a. Page 1, paragraph 1, of memorandum to
the Executive Director-Comptroller states
that the attachment has been reviewed by
the Office of Security, CI Staff and Central
Cover but has not been staffed out by either
since there has not been anything to staff
out yet.

Comment: A quick reading of the proposal
indicates that a formal response of the Office
of Security ought to have a careful study of
each part of the Security Office that might
become involved in the support and maintainance
of such an organization and costing out of all
security support. As to the proposal itself,
since the policy decision for advising and
guiding as to Security principles in outside
activities is primarily in the Employee
Activity area, certainly a representative
from EAB ought to be intimately involved

in the proposal from this point forward if
it is to receive further consideration. (As
far as I know, this is the first reading of
this in EAB).

b. Page 2, Purpose of Study. This paragraph,
in noting purpose is to present advantages and
disadvantages, indicates it presents some of
the security considerations. It is believed
the proposal needs to be fully studied in depth
in EAB and within the Security Office to make
certain that no aspect of security is overlooked.

c. Page 2. The paragraph entitled the "Scope of
the Study" notes the following references to
Security:

d) Are security considerations such as to
make the formation of such an association
undesirable?

Comment: Answer to this question is dependent
upon what are the security considerations?
These need to be defined on an item by item
basis, and some of these will change as the
proposal approaches final definition. For
example, some of the considerations now
present are:

1. Should overt employees only be a basic
rule? To accept all the employees may mean
the Agency may have to continue to provide
professional security advice and protection
for continued maintainance or solution of
cover problems.

2. Employees in CIA are organized along
compartmentation lines. Is this to be a
similar arrangement in the organization?

- 2 -

If not, how does one prevent the problem
of ex-employees taking the attitude, now
it can all be told, and particularly when
telling "only" a trusted ex-employee!

3. Is the association to have regular
meetings and activities? If so, isn't
security always going to be a factor
to be reckoned with in all the association's
activities?

4. Is the organization to be closely tied
to Agency facilities, records and support?
Will it not become known as a "company
union" which the Agency might find difficult
to keep house for or divorce when a policy
clash occurred that splits its leadership and
that of the Agency. If the element of control
is not always present, how will security be
maintained?

2. In short, the proposed organization would seem to
present more of a security threat without an elaborate means to
maintain it, and the threat may far outweigh the supposed benefits.
Whether or not it will be desirable from an employee view and
whether or not these security problems may be worked out,
remains a question until all of the questions possible are asked
and answered. In this regard, the Agency experience in this
area that is recalled is with the "Veterans of OSS". This may
provide some criteria, however, its activities as an organization
were quite limited, and in the nature of the informal, attend if
you wish, once a year celebration. If the association is to be
similar, some of the noted considerations may not apply.

25X1A9a

Deputy Chief
Employee Activity Branch